

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-11 have been amended, and claims 12-17 are newly added to emphasize various aspects of applicants' invention. Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended over the telephone on March 30, 2007 where claim amendments that address the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101, and 35 U.S.C. §112, and various novel aspects of the invention were discussed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-7 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments herein.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-11 Under 35 U.S.C §112

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments herein.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-11 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Raymond, *et al.* (US 2005/0091601 A1) ("Raymond *et al.*"). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Raymond, *et al.*, does not teach or suggest applicants' claimed invention. In particular, applicants' claimed invention relates to analyzing features of one or more documents, and representing such document(s) with unique domain models to facilitate locating, indexing, and categorizing, for example, such document(s).

In particular, claim 1 recites ***a computer-implemented method to process a document, comprising: analyzing features of a document; and generating a set of domain models, as a function of the analyzed features, that represent the document.*** Raymond, *et al.* does not teach or suggest such claimed features of applicants' invention. Rather, the reference merely teaches

facilitating design of user interfaces through employment of domain, user, and task models. There is no mention or suggestion of analyzing a document for features, and generating a set of unique domain models, as a function of the analyzed features, that represent the document.

The sections of Raymond, *et al.* cited in the Office Action teach conventional model building where a models are created by a designer using various design criteria, and thereafter employing such models across new information to facilitate user interface development. There is no notion of creating unique models for a particular document in connection with representing the same document. More particularly, the claimed invention creates one or more unique models to represent a particular document, and employment of such models in connection with taking actions in connection with that document, while Raymond, *et al.* generates common models that are applied across a large plurality of new items as is conventional with use of models (*e.g.*, using common models to facilitate user interface design for a large number of users, preferences, entities, etc.). In other words, the cited art utilizes a small set of common models to facilitate handling numerous items, while the claimed invention generates one or more unique models to represent a single document, and for example employing such models in connection with taking action related to the document. It is readily apparent from the foregoing comments that Raymond, *et al.* does not teach or suggest applicants' invention as recited in claim 1, and the claims that depend there from.

Independent claim 9 recites ***a computer-implemented method to facilitate locating a document, comprising: receiving a query related to locating the document; and searching across a plurality of domain models that respectively represent a plurality of documents; and identifying a set of the domain models that match criteria of the receive query.*** Raymond, *et al.* does not teach or suggest a method for searching for documents let alone searching across domain models that represent respective documents as in applicants' claimed invention.

Independent claims 10 and 11 likewise recite features relating to representing document(s) via unique domain models, and as noted *supra* Raymond, *et al.* does not teach or suggest such aspects of the claimed invention.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Raymond, *et al.* neither anticipates nor makes obvious applicants' claimed invention, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP1836USA].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731